



Application No. 10/688,947  
Attorney Docket: 038849.52804US

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheets of drawings includes changes to Figs. 5 and 6. The legend "Related Art" has been added to the figures.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

**REMARKS**

Favorable consideration and allowance of claims 1-5, 7-8 and 11-16 are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following comments.

In the Office Action, the following rejections were made:

1) Claims 2 and 13-14 were rejected as being anticipated by previously-cited Miyamoto et al. (US 5,900,961).

2) Claim 4 was rejected as being obvious over Miyamoto et al.

3) Claims 3, 15 and 16 were rejected as being obvious over Miyamoto et al. in view of previously-cited Yoshino (JP 7-178957).

4) Claim 5 was rejected as being obvious over Miyamoto et al. in view of newly-cited Herloski et al. (US 4,355,859).

5) Claims 6 and 12 were rejected as being obvious over Miyamoto et al. in view of previously-cited Asada et al. (U.S. 6,552,987).

6) Claim 11 was rejected as being obvious over Miyamoto et al. in view of Asada et al. and further in view of previously-cited Ono et al. (JP 2001-337291).

7) Claims 1 and 8 were rejected over Miyamoto et al. in view of Yoshino, Herloski et al., and Asada et al.

8) Claim 7 was rejected over Miyamoto et al. in view of Yoshino, Herloski et al., and Asada et al., and further in view of Ono et al.

By the present Reply, claim 2 is amended to include the features of claim 6, i.e., the first and second flexible cables claimed in original claim 6. Also, claim 6 is canceled, and claims 11 and 12 are amended to change their dependencies.

Applicants submit that amended claim 2 is neither anticipated by Miyamoto et al., nor obvious over Miyamoto et al. in view of Asada et al. The Office Action states that Miyamoto et al. fails to teach the flexible cables. *See p. 8, line 13.* Applicants agree that Miyamoto et al. does not disclose the claimed flexible cables. Accordingly, amended claim 2 is not anticipated by Miyamoto et al.

Furthermore, Applicants submit that it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the teachings of Miyamoto et al. to include the claimed flexible cables. The Office Action applies Asada et al. in the rejection of original claim 6, asserting that it would have been obvious to modify Miyamoto et al. by the teachings of Asada et al. *Page 6, numbered paragraph 8.* Essential to the assertion of the Office Action, however, is that it would have been obvious to add a feature (i.e., flexible cables) to Miyamoto et al. that is entirely superfluous. Thus, the Office Action appears to rely on a hindsight approach to the teachings of the references.

As disclosed in the Miyamoto et al., Miyamoto's circuit board 211 includes an IC device 208 for controlling the semiconductor laser unit 202, the motor 203 and the horizontal synchronization signal detecting unit 207. *Col. 4, lines 50-52.* As illustrated in FIGS. 7A, 7B and 8, the IC device 208 is connected to the same circuit board 211 as the motor 203 and the semiconductor laser 202. *See col. 5, lines 50-54.* Thus, Miyamoto's circuit is intended to operate and does operate via the circuit board, without flexible cables. Adding flexible cables to Miyamoto's circuit would introduce an unnecessary complication and additional cost to the

circuit. Therefore, it would not have been obvious to modify Miyamoto's circuit to include the flexible cables of Asada et al. Accordingly, claim 2 is allowable over the combination of Miyamoto et al. and Asada et al.

Claims 3-5 and 11-16 are allowable, at least because of their dependence from claim 2.

For reasons analogous to those for claim 2, Applicants submit that claim 1 and its dependent claims 7 and 8 are allowable over the prior art.

With regard to the "Response to Arguments" in the Office Action (p. 10), Applicants have the following comments. The Office Action asserts that Miyamoto's disclosure in col. 4, line 65 that the IC device 208 (FIGS. 7A & 7B) is in contact with the external air means that the IC device is mounted outside of the housing. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Miyamoto's housing includes a cover 212, which has a hole 212-2 that is formed around the IC device 208. As stated in Miyamoto et al., "The hole 212-2 is formed around the IC device 208, in order to enable functional checking of the IC device 208 without detachment of the cover 212." *Col. 4, lines 62-64*. The IC device 208 contacts the external air, because of the hole 212-2 in the cover 212. If the IC device 208 were provided outside of the frame body, there would be no need or use for the hole 212-2.

Furthermore, as described in col. 5, lines 50-54 of Miyamoto et al., the IC device 208 is mounted on the circuit board 211. As illustrated in FIG. 8, the circuit board 211 is located at the bottom of the optical housing 201, which is far below the hole 212-2 through which the IC device 208 is accessible. Thus,


Miyamoto et al. discloses that its IC device 208 is provided inside the frame body. Therefore, Miyamoto et al. fails to teach or suggest the second circuit board of claim 1 or the circuit board of claim 2, both of which are provided outside the frame body. Claims 1 and 2 and their dependent claims 3-5, 7-8 and 11-16, respectfully, are allowable for this additional reason.

If there are any questions regarding this amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket #010755.51346).

Respectfully submitted,

September 26, 2006

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Jeffrey D. Sanok  
Registration No. 32,169  
Cameron W. Beddard  
Registration No. 46,545

CROWELL & MORING LLP  
Intellectual Property Group  
P.O. Box 14300  
Washington, DC 20044-4300  
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500  
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844  
JDS:CWB:crr  
2857245



3/4

FIG. 4






FIG. 5



Relevant Art

4/4

FIG. 6



Relevant Art